

<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

The majority influence on interminority attitudes : The secondary transfer effect of positive and negative contact

Brylka, Asteria Anna

2016

Brylka , A A , Jasinskaja-Lahti , I & Mähönen , T A E 2016 , ' The majority influence on interminority attitudes : The secondary transfer effect of positive and negative contact ' , International Journal of Intercultural Relations , vol. 50 , pp. 76-88 . <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2015.12.007>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/234349>

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2015.12.007>

acceptedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

The Majority Influence on Interminority Attitudes: The Secondary Transfer Effect of Positive and Negative Contact

Asteria Brylka^{a*}, Inga Jasinskaja-Lahti^a, & Tuuli Anna Mähönen^b

^a Department of Social Research (Social Psychology), University of Helsinki, P.O. Box 54 (Unioninkatu 37), FIN-00014 University of Helsinki, Finland (e-mails: asteria.brylka@helsinki.fi and inga.jasinskaja@helsinki.fi)

^b Open University, University of Helsinki, P.O. Box 53 (Fabianinkatu 32), FIN-00014 University of Helsinki, Finland (e-mail: tuuli-anna.mahonen@helsinki.fi)

*corresponding author

Abstract

Among minority members, *positive* contact with the majority was previously found to improve not only the attitudes towards the majority but also the attitudes towards minority outgroups (*the secondary transfer effect*; STE). However, the roles of *negative* intergroup contact and minority groups' social status in the STE have not been yet examined. Therefore, in the present study, we investigated the association between both positive and negative contact with the national majority group (Finns) and mutual attitudes among high-status Estonian ($n = 171$) and low-status Russian ($n = 180$) immigrants in Finland. Two mediators of the STE were tested: attitudes toward the majority (attitude generalisation) and public collective self-esteem (diagonal hostility). While positive and negative STEs emerging via attitude generalisation were expected to occur among both immigrant groups, the mediating effect of public collective self-esteem was assumed only for members of the low-status group. In both immigrant groups, the relationship between positive contact with the majority group and attitudes towards the other immigrant group was positive and indirect through more

favourable attitudes towards majority group members. The same mechanism characterised negative contact, where the indirect effect was mediated by less positive attitudes towards Finns. As predicted, public collective self-esteem mediated the effects of positive and negative contact with majority group members on attitudes towards the other minority only among low-status Russian immigrants. The results call for the acknowledgement of different mechanisms explaining the STE among minority groups enjoying different social statuses in host society.

Keywords: secondary transfer effect; STE; interminority relations; immigrants; intergroup contact; public collective self-esteem

The Majority Influence on Interminority Attitudes: The Secondary Transfer Effect of Positive and Negative Contact

1 Introduction

Due to globalisation and growing cultural diversity, social cohesion and intergroup relations in plural societies are no longer determined by the quality of only majority-minority relations, but also by the quality of interactions between various minority groups. However, interminority relations do not happen in a social vacuum. The majority has, as the dominant group in society, the power to influence interminority relations either positively by promoting intergroup solidarity or negatively by, for instance, reproducing ethnic hierarchies (on ethnic hierarchies in multicultural societies, see Hagendoorn, 1993, 1995). The negative influence of the majority group on interminority relations can be seen in, for example, the United States where Whites manifest their ethnic preferences through the notion of the “model minority” (see e.g., Osajima, 2005). This notion conveys the message that Asian Americans are the preferred minority group among Whites due to their high achievements. At the same time, this model minority is compared against Black Americans, who are being criticised for not

reaching the same high standards as Asians. Such positioning of one minority group against another may be harmful for smooth and cooperative interminority relations as it potentially promotes competition and animosity.

Thus, due to the power the majority group has in shaping interminority attitudes and behaviour, studying majority-minority contact and its impact on interminority relations is crucial. However, only fairly recently researchers turned to investigating intergroup relations between different ethno-cultural minority groups (e.g., Barlow, Louis, & Terry, 2010; Craig & Richeson, 2012; Martinovic, Verkuyten, & Weesie, 2011) and even less is known about the processes through which positive and especially negative majority-minority contact is translated into interminority relations in the context of immigration. As a consequence, our knowledge on interminority relations and the role of majority groups in their dynamics still remains limited.

Therefore, to investigate the nature of and the psychological mechanisms involved in intergroup relations between different minority groups in diverse societies, we examine the association between positive and negative contact with the national majority group (Finns) and attitudes of Estonian and Russian immigrants in Finland towards each other. To do so, we use the framework of *the secondary transfer effect* (STE; Pettigrew, 2009), that is, the generalisation of the effects of contact with one (primary) outgroup on another (secondary) outgroup. In this study, the primary outgroup is the national majority and the secondary outgroup is a minority group. Moreover, we argue that interminority relations mirror intergroup relations between the national majority and ethnic minority groups.

2 Minority Groups in Finland

Finland, unlike many other Western Countries, does not have a long history of immigration. Currently, around 5 per cent of the country's total population is of foreign decent (i.e., around 300 000 individuals; Statistics Finland, 2012, 2014a). Of all foreign-born

individuals in Finland, two immigrant groups stand out numerically and significantly differ in social standing in Finnish society (see Statistics Finland, 2014a). The largest group which constitutes a little more than one per cent of the total population are Russian-speaking immigrants from Russia and the former Soviet republics. Russians are also one of the oldest ethnic minorities in Finland, with a history of settlement going back to the beginning of the 19th century, when the Grand Duchy of Finland was a part of the Tsardom of Russia. The second largest immigrant group, which accounts for slightly less than one per cent of the total population, are Estonians whose immigration to Finland rose significantly in 2004 when Estonia joined the European Union (EU).

Relations between these two particular groups are of interest not only due to the numerical size of these groups in society, but also, perhaps even more importantly, due to their theoretically relevant group characteristics, that is, relative similarity combined with status differences. The status differences between the two immigrant groups are reflected mostly in their position in the labour market and attitudes towards these groups among majority Finns. While in 2013, 15 per cent of Russian immigrants were unemployed, the eight per cent unemployment rate among Estonian immigrants was not much higher than the five per cent unemployment rate among majority Finns (Statistics Finland, 2014b). The ethnic hierarchy based on the majority members' acceptance of twenty four immigrant groups reported by Jaakkola (2005, 2009) shows that while Estonians are among the most accepted and wanted newcomers, Russians are among the least welcome immigrants in Finland.

In culturally diverse societies, ethnic hierarchies typically reflect the degree of cultural differences between the ethnic majority and different minority groups (for discussion, see Schalk-Soekar, van de Vijver, & Hoogsteder, 2004). Thus, the different positions of Estonians and Russians in the ethnic hierarchy in Finland can to some extent be attributed to the degree of cultural distance between each of these groups and majority Finns. Even though

both groups are of a similar Eastern European background, Estonians can be perceived by Finns as culturally closer to them than Russians, due to Estonians' linguistic and religious (Estonian Protestantism vs. Russian Orthodoxy) similarity. Both Estonians and Finns also seem to share similar cultural and political values which are reflected in the membership of both Estonia and Finland in the EU. Last but not least, the recent war in Ukraine has brought tension to the relations between the EU member states and Russia. This can possibly contribute to more reserved attitudes towards Russians in Finland, which would make the perception of cultural distance and threats between Russians and Finns more salient. For example, Russian immigrants' loyalty to their new home country has recently been increasingly questioned, especially in the case of holders of double citizenship (e.g., YLE, 2015).

3 Contact in Intergroup Relations

3.1 The Effects of Positive and Negative Intergroup Contact

According to the widely studied contact hypothesis (Allport, 1954, see also Pettigrew, 1998), face-to-face contact with outgroup members is a powerful mean in reducing intergroup prejudice. This beneficial role of contact for intergroup relations has been typically examined in a majority-minority context. To date, there is a plethora of studies showing that intergroup contact results in more positive intergroup perceptions, including more favourable attitudes towards outgroups (for review, see e.g., Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Although the positive effect of contact on outgroup attitudes was found to be somewhat stronger for majority than for minority group members (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2006), thus far positive intergroup contact remains the most prominent tool in improving intergroup relations among members of different social groups.

Relative to positive contact, the effects of *negative* contact on outgroup attitudes are less frequently studied. Nevertheless, the few studies conducted so far show that also negative contact has important implications for intergroup relations. For example, both Barlow et al. (2012) and Aberson (2015) found negative interactions with members of ethnic outgroups to be more strongly linked to increased prejudice towards these groups among members of the majority group than positive contact was to prejudice reduction. Similar results were obtained by Graf, Paolini, and Rubin (2014) who found that positive contact with different national outgroups, although more frequent than negative contact, was only weakly associated with more positive attitudes towards these outgroups. Instead, negative contact predicted negative outgroup attitudes more consistently, especially when contact negativity concerned the contact person, rather than the circumstances of the contact situation. Negative contact was a more consistent predictor of outgroup attitudes (prejudice and negative metaperceptions) than positive contact also in the study by Techakesari and colleagues (2015) among both Western (White American) and non-Western (Hong Kong Chinese and Buddhist Thai) participants.

3.2 The Secondary Transfer Effect

While the beneficial effect of contact on attitudes towards primary outgroups (i.e. outgroups directly involved in the intergroup interactions in question) are nowadays well recognised, it is less clear how contact with one outgroup can help reducing prejudice towards other, secondary outgroups. Pettigrew (2009) proposed and found in his cross-sectional study, that positive contact with a primary outgroup is associated with more positive attitudes towards secondary outgroups not involved in intergroup contact directly. In later cross-sectional, longitudinal and experimental studies, this generalisation of positive contact from one group onto another known as the secondary transfer effect of contact (STE) has been shown to emerge over and above the effects of actual contact with secondary outgroups (see Tausch et al., 2010). Although studies exploring the STE resulting from *negative* intergroup

interactions have been called for (Pettigrew, 2009), thus far it remains largely unexplored to what extent *negative* intergroup contact can produce the STE (but see Mähönen & Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2015).

STEs resulting from positive contact can be observed among majority and minority members across different national contexts and towards different (social and ethno-cultural) minority groups (e.g., Pettigrew, 2009; Hindriks, Verkuyten, & Coenders, 2014; Schmid, Hewstone, & Tausch, 2014). However, studies on the STE conducted among minority groups typically focus on the beneficial effects of contact with one minority group on the improvement of attitudes towards other minority groups (e.g., Hindriks et al., 2014; Pettigrew, 2009). To the best of our knowledge, the effects of contact with the national majority group on attitudes towards different ethno-cultural minorities were investigated only by Bowman and Griffin (2012), Tausch et al. (2010) and most recently by Shook, Hopkins and Koech (2015) as well as Mähönen and Jasinskaja-Lahti (2015), with the patterns of results remaining less than clear.

In the study of Bowman and Griffin (2012), positive STEs resulting from positive contact with the national majority depended on how similar the outgroup's social status was to that of the majority group. Specifically, STEs among minority members were stronger when the secondary minority group enjoyed similar social status as the national majority group, therefore had a high position in the country's ethnic hierarchy. In contrast, Tausch et al. (2010) found that the most pronounced positive STEs occurred when secondary outgroups were small and relatively irrelevant for the ingroup, while in the case of the primary and the secondary outgroup being similar to each other (e.g., Greek/Turkish Cypriots and mainland Greeks/Turks), the positive STEs were the weakest. In the longitudinal studies by Shook et al. (2015) and Mähönen and Jasinskaja-Lahti (2015), in turn, positive contact with the majority resulted in more positive attitudes towards quite widely defined "other" minority groups.

Specifically, sharing a dormitory room with a White roommate (interracial contact) improved attitudes of racial minority students towards other racial minority groups in Shook's et al. (2015). In the study of Mähönen and Jasinskaja-Lahti (2015) conducted among Finnish ethnic re-emigrants from Russia, positive contact with majority Finns resulted in more positive attitudes towards other immigrants.

4 Mediators of the Secondary Transfer Effect

Due to the inconsistent occurrence of the STE across social settings, different processes mediating the relationship between contact with a primary outgroup and attitudes towards a secondary outgroup have been suggested (see Lolliot et al., 2013). Nevertheless, our understanding of the psychological mechanisms explaining the STE is still very limited. So far, the mechanism that has proved its importance for the development of the STE (e.g., Bowman & Griffin, 2012; Pettigrew, 2009) is based on the mediating role of attitudes towards the primary outgroups and known as attitude generalisation. Failures to establish other reliable mediators of the investigated contact-attitude relationship other than attitudes towards a primary outgroup (see Lolliot et al., 2013) prompt for research further examining this social psychological process, while controlling for attitude generalisation. In the following, we provide a more rigorous review of studies on the role of attitude generalisation in the STE and suggest a new mediator of the STE, namely public collective self-esteem.

4.1 Attitudes Towards the Primary Outgroup

To date, studies on the STE consider *attitudes towards the primary outgroup* to be the most reliable mediator of the generalisation of the effects of positive contact with a primary outgroup on attitudes towards a secondary outgroup (Lolliot et al., 2013). The mediating process occurs due to generalisation of attitudes from one object to another, similar object (see also Fazio, Eiser, Shook, 2004; Shook, Fazio, & Easier, 2007). Put more precisely,

the effects of positive contact with a primary outgroup elicit more positive attitudes towards this outgroup, and can also spread on secondary outgroups which are not directly involved in a contact situation. This mediated mechanism of the STE is referred to as the attitude generalisation hypothesis (see Lolliot et al., 2013). Preliminary evidence of this process was found by Pettigrew (2009) in a cross-sectional sample of majority members in Germany, among whom more positive contact with immigrants was associated with less anti-immigrant prejudice and this, in turn, was linked to less prejudice towards homeless and gay people. In this study, however, Pettigrew did not control for the participants' prior contact with the homeless and the homosexuals. This left an alternative explanation that attitudes towards these outgroups improved not only because of attitude generalisation but also due to prior positive contact with these groups plausible (the secondary contact problem; see Tausch et al., 2010).

To rule out the secondary contact problem as a competing explanation of the STE, research had to take into account prior interactions with secondary outgroups. The first authors to corroborate the importance of attitudes towards the primary outgroup as a mediator of the STE *over* and *above* the effects of prior contact with secondary outgroups were Tausch et al. (2010). Across different cross-sectional and longitudinal samples and various national settings, Tausch and her colleagues found that contact with a primary outgroup had a beneficial effect on attitudes towards this outgroup, and these more favourable attitudes further resulted in more positive attitudes towards various secondary outgroups. Also Bowman and Griffin (2012) corroborated the mediating effect of attitude generalisation in the relationship between contact with different primary outgroups and attitudes towards secondary outgroups, controlling for prior interactions with the relevant secondary outgroup.

4.2 Public Collective Self-Esteem

Self-esteem refers to feelings of self-worth and self-respect an individual has towards him- or herself (e.g., Rosenberg, 1979). The source of such positive feelings are, however, not only personal attributes: One's social standing relative to others and self-esteem can also origin from collective self (see Crocker, Luhtanen, Blaine, & Broadnax, 1994) and result in the emergence of collective self-esteem (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992). In this study, we particularly focus on *public* collective self-esteem, the specific component of collective self-esteem which reflects one's perception of how other people, that is members of various outgroups, evaluate his or her ingroup (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992).

How outgroup members evaluate one's ethnic ingroup is, in turn, closely related to the ingroup's position in the country's ethnic hierarchy: The position, which is determined by factors such as perceived cultural characteristics of the group, its socioeconomic status and perceived threat that it poses to the national in-group (Pepels & Hagendoorn, 2000). Although ethnic hierarchies are established by national majority groups, they are acknowledged and also often shared by members of different minority groups (Snellman & Ekehammar, 2005). Thus, it is reasonable to conclude that the perception of one's ethnic ingroup in society, is reflected in the ingroup members' public collective self-esteem, which in turn can be crucial for understanding intergroup relations. Specifically, as the role of the national majority group in the creation of the ethnic hierarchy of the country is *especially* powerful, we argue that the public collective self-esteem of minority group members mediates the relationship between contact with the majority group and attitudes towards outgroups.

Collective self-esteem is based on one's social identity and individuals tend to maintain it positive as much as they wish to maintain positive social identity (Crocker et al., 1994). Intergroup setting, however, can be challenging for maintaining high collective self-esteem, especially for immigrants who belong to groups that are devalued or even discriminated against by the majority. For instance, public collective self-esteem was found to

decline as a reaction to increasing perceived group discrimination (Barry & Grilo, 2003). Importantly, self-esteem depends on social validation. Therefore, *especially* under circumstances threatening their social identity, individuals aim at maintaining or restoring its high levels (for review, see, Pyszczynski, Greenberg, Solomon, Arndt, & Schimel, 2004), and this is done by, for instance, taking a more negative orientation towards outgroups (Long & Spears, 1997; Rubin & Hewstone, 1998). Thus, based on the aforementioned theorisations and empirical findings, in an intergroup setting in which threats to one's social identity are possible or even common (e.g., when one is a member of a low-status group), high collective self-esteem is likely to be associated with more negative orientation towards outgroups. However, there is also some evidence contradicting this assumption and showing that particularly high *public* collective self-esteem may, in fact, foster more positive intergroup relations. For instance, Bikmen (2011) showed that high public collective self-esteem was associated with more positive outgroup attitudes among Black Americans towards Asian Americans. In addition, the relationship between contact and attitudes towards Asians was positive only when Blacks had high public collective self-esteem, while contact and attitudes were not associated with each other when public collective self-esteem was low. Similarly, Ruttenberg, Zea and Sigelman (1996) found that the lower public collective self-esteem was among Arabs, the stronger was derogation of the salient religious outgroup (Jews).

Thus, the results of the aforementioned studies provide strong grounds to claim that public collective self-esteem plays an important role in interminority relations. They also foster a need for more research clarifying the role of public collective self-esteem in the development of the STE resulting from contact with the national majority group on attitudes towards minority outgroups.

5 The Interplay Between Group Status and Public Collective Self-Esteem in the STE

The results of the study of Bowman and Griffin (2012; see also Bikmen, 2011) conducted among minority group members strongly suggest that outgroups' status in society is a significant *moderator* of the relationship between intergroup contact and outgroup attitudes. Specifically, the strongest STEs resulting from contact with the majority group occurred for the secondary minority groups enjoying similar social status as the national majority group—that is a high position in the country's ethnic hierarchy. Thus, it is evident that group status, both in terms of size and power, has to be taken into account when studying the effects of contact with the majority group on attitudes towards other minority groups.

We argue that the moderating role of group status should be analysed jointly with the mediating role of public collective self-esteem, and that this should be done through the lens of the asymmetric horizontal hostility hypothesis by White and Langer (1999; see also White, Schmitt, & Langer, 2006). According to this hypothesis, minority groups tend to have negative attitudes towards other minority groups which are quite culturally similar to them, but are considered to have a higher status in society. As proposed by White and colleagues, outgroup derogation emerging from horizontal hostility is driven by the need to secure a positive ingroup identity, so in this way their theory is related to the public collective self-esteem concerns discussed above.

In this study, we build on the asymmetric horizontal hostility hypothesis and aim to develop it further with the notion of *diagonal hostility*. As intergroup relations in culturally diverse societies reflect at least two dimensions, namely cultural similarity and status position, we analyse the impact of these two dimensions on outgroup attitudes jointly. While the extent of cultural similarities to the national majority has been argued to largely determine the social position of each minority group in society's ethnic hierarchy (see, e.g. Schalk-Soekar et al., 2004), these similarities are not solely responsible for status differences. The role of the multidimensionality of social space and the relativeness of group power in intergroup

relations has recently been brought up by Tawa and his colleagues (Tawa, Suyemoto, & Tauriac, 2013; Tawa, Negrón, Suyemoto, & Carter, 2015) in their studies in the US context conducted among Black, Asian and White Americans. The authors showed that, instead of approaching interminority relations as vertical, that is, reflecting the groups' positions in ethnic hierarchy, we need to acknowledge that different minority groups experience power and privilege relative to one another, and both relative to the dominant majority.

In the context of the present study, Russian immigrants are culturally quite close to the Finnish majority (e.g., Christian religion and cultural traditions) but are nevertheless treated much more negatively than Estonian immigrants, and almost as negatively as culturally more distant groups such as Somalis and Arabs (Jaakkola, 2005; Jasinskaja-Lahti, Liebkind, & Perhoniemi, 2006). Thus, when trying to explain interminority relations, we need to acknowledge that attitudes are based on both horizontal closeness to the majority (i.e., cultural similarities) and vertical closeness to the majority (i.e., status). We propose that the derogation of culturally close but higher-status minority groups by lower-status minority groups can be best described with the concept of diagonal hostility.

6 The Present Study

6.1 The Design

In the present study we focus on testing the STEs resulting from contact with the Finnish national majority group on attitudes towards the other minority group among Estonian and Russian immigrants in Finland. The STEs are examined in a mediational analysis in which they shall occur as statistically significant indirect effects of positive and negative contact with the majority group on attitudes towards the minority outgroup; these indirect effects are expected to occur through attitudes towards the majority group and public collective self-esteem of the minority ingroup, respectively (see Figure 1). If any of the

aforementioned indirect effects emerges as non-significant, that means that the corresponding STE does not occur. The STEs presented in Figure 1 will be tested accounting for the moderating role of group status (see specific hypotheses in the Hypotheses section).

Figure 1 about here

Figure 1. Schematic presentation of the positive and negative STEs.

6.2 The Hypotheses

To summarise our predictions for the present study, firstly, we expect the process of attitude generalisation to mediate the STE resulting from contact with the majority group among members of both the high- and the low-status immigrant group. Particularly, we expect more positive attitudes towards majority Finns to mediate the positive association between close positive contact with members of this majority group and attitudes towards the other immigrant group for both Estonian and Russian immigrants (H1). H1 is supported if the indirect effect of close positive contact with majority Finns on attitudes towards the other immigrant group, mediated by more positive attitudes towards majority Finns, is statistically significant for both Estonian and Russian immigrants. H1 will be rejected if the aforementioned positive indirect effect emerges to be statistically non-significant for both groups.

We also expect a corresponding but opposite-in-valence indirect effect of negative everyday contact with the majority group. Specifically, the negative association between negative contact with Finns and attitudes towards the other immigrant group will be mediated by less positive attitudes towards Finns (H2). H2 is supported if the indirect effect of negative everyday contact with majority Finns on attitudes towards the other immigrant group, mediated by less positive attitudes towards majority Finns, is statistically significant for both Estonian and Russian immigrants. H2 is not supported if the aforementioned negative indirect effect are statistically non-significant for both groups.

Secondly, we anticipate the relationship between both positive and negative contact with majority Finns and attitudes towards the other immigrant group to occur through public collective self-esteem, but only among the low-status immigrant group. Although both Estonian and Russian immigrants are minority members and their public collective self-esteem could be expected to be affected by contact with majority Finns (see Schmitt, Branscombe, Postmes, & Garcia, 2014), the different status of these two immigrant groups is expected to moderate the mediating effect of public collective self-esteem on attitudes toward the secondary outgroup. Specifically, both positive and negative contact with majority members will produce the STE via public collective self-esteem among a lower status immigrant group (Russian immigrants) toward a higher status immigrant group (Estonian immigrants) but not vice versa. Thus, positive close contact with majority Finns will be associated with higher public collective self-esteem among lower-status Russian immigrants which, in turn, will be associated with their more favourable attitudes towards higher-status Estonian immigrants (H3). H3 is supported if the indirect effect of close positive contact with majority Finns on attitudes towards Estonian immigrants, mediated by higher public collective self-esteem, is (1) statistically significant for the Russian group and (2) statistically non-significant for the Estonian group, and (3) there is a statistically significant difference

between these indirect effects among the two groups. H3 is not supported if the aforementioned requirements are not met.

For negative everyday contact, we expect the same indirect association as for positive close contact but of the opposite valence (see Branscombe et al., 1999; Branscombe & Wann, 1994; Cassidy et al., 2004), showing the pattern of diagonal hostility. Specifically, more negative everyday contact with majority Finns will be associated with lower public collective self-esteem of lower-status Russian immigrants which, in turn, will be associated with less positive attitudes towards higher-status Estonian immigrants (H4). H4 is supported if the indirect effect of negative everyday contact with majority Finns on attitudes towards Estonian immigrants, mediated by lower public collective self-esteem, is (1) statistically significant for the Russian group and (2) statistically non-significant for the Estonian group, and (3) there is a statistically significant difference between this indirect effects among the two groups. H4 is not supported if the aforementioned requirements are not met.

6 Method

6.1 Participants and Procedure

Data for this study were collected with a postal survey conducted between May and October 2014 among representative samples of Estonian and Russian immigrants in Finland drawn by the Finnish National Population Register Centre. The selection criteria for the immigrants were their mother tongue (Estonian or Russian, respectively), country of residence before moving to Finland (Estonia or the Russian Federation, respectively), and immigration to Finland by the end of 2010. Participation in the study was voluntary and anonymous. The questionnaires were translated by native speakers of Estonian and Russian language and were provided to the participants in their mother tongue. The response rate to the survey was 26.9 per cent for the Estonian and 30.8 per cent for the Russian sample.

Data for this study come from the final samples of Estonian ($n = 171$) and Russian ($n = 180$) immigrants who reported having actual contact with members of the other immigrant group. The Estonian and Russian samples do not differ between each other regarding the gender composition ($\chi(1) = 1.041, p = .308$) but Estonian respondents are older ($t(349) = -2.491, p = .013$) and are less educated ($t(349) = 4.536, p < .001$) than Russian respondents. In the Estonian sample, there are 109 female ($M_{age} = 47.17, M_{edu} = 14.44$) and 62 male ($M_{age} = 46.26, M_{edu} = 13.19$) participants. While female and male respondents are of the same age ($t(169) = -0.510, p = .610$), women are slightly longer educated than men ($t(169) = -2.390, p = .018$). Among Russians, 124 participants are female ($M_{age} = 42.23, M_{edu} = 16.47$) and 56 are male ($M_{age} = 47.14, M_{edu} = 15.27$). While women are significantly younger than men ($t(178) = 2.595, p = .010$), the two genders do not differ with the length of their education ($t(178) = -1.454, p = .148$).

6.2 Materials

Contact with majority Finns was assessed with items which have been constructed based on the existing contact literature (for review see Lolliot et al., 2015; see also Barlow et al., 2012; Voci & Hewstone, 2003). Positive contact was conceptualised as the quantity (one item: “*How many ethnic Finns do you know well?*”), as well as the quality (one item: “*How often do you experience encounters with ethnic Finns you know well as pleasant?*”) of close contact. This is because both the quantity and the favourability of outgroup contact have been found to result in more positive outgroup attitudes and that specifically close positive contact (usually understood as friendship) is a stronger predictor of positive outgroup attitudes than more everyday forms of contact (for review see, Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008). Participants marked their responses on a scale ranging from one (*none*) to five (*many*) for the first item and one (*never*) to five (*always*) for the second item. The items were added to comprise a reliable scale of positive contact (Spearman-Brown reliability statistic for a two-item measure

of $\rho = .60$ for Estonian and $\rho = .44$ for Russian immigrants). The higher scores indicate having more frequent and positive contact with members of the majority groups.

Negative contact, in turn, was conceptualised as *casual* negative contact with majority members during everyday interactions in different social settings and assessed with a single item: “*How often do you experience brief interactions (for example at work, on the bus, in the street, in shops, in the neighbourhood and so on) with ethnic Finns as unpleasant*”? The response scale ranged from one (*never*) to five (*always*). Higher scores indicate more frequent negative contact with Finns during every day casual interactions. The difference in the conceptualisation of negative contact is based on the following. While friendship potential is an important and more powerful prerequisite of positive outgroup attitudes than other, more casual forms of positive contact (for review see, Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008), negative attitudinal reactions among minorities often stem from perceived *group's* devaluation or discrimination (Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999). Therefore, as negative casual interactions with majority members encountered repeatedly in different social contexts are likely to be attributed to one's immigrant background (group membership), these casual negative encounters with majority members are expected to be a more reliable predictor of outgroup attitudes than close negative contact. Prior positive and negative contact with the minority outgroup (control variable) was measured accordingly as in the case of positive and negative contact with the majority group.

Outgroup attitudes towards majority Finns and the minority outgroup were measured with a single item, a commonly used ‘feeling thermometer’ (see e.g., Hewstone, Cairns, Voci, Hamberger, & Niens, 2006; Tausch et al., 2010), with an answering scale ranging from one (*extremely negative*) to seven (*extremely positive*). Participants were asked about their general feelings towards Estonian immigrants living in Finland (Russian participants), Russian immigrants living in Finland (Estonian participants), and majority Finns

(both Estonian and Russian participants). Higher scores indicate more positive attitudes towards the respective outgroups.

Public collective self-esteem of the ingroup was measured with four items adapted from Crocker and Luhtanen (1992). The items were: *“Overall, <INGROUP> immigrants are considered good by others,” “Most people consider <INGROUP> immigrants, in general, to be more incompetent than other immigrant groups,” “In general, other respect <INGROUP> immigrants,”* and *“In general, others think that <INGROUP> immigrants are unworthy.”* Participants marked their answers on a scale ranging from one (*no, not at all*) to five (*yes, very much*). The items comprised a reliable scale ($\alpha = .77$ for Estonian and $\alpha = .75$ for Russian immigrants), with higher scores indicating stronger public collective self-esteem of the ingroup.

6.3 Data Analysis

We adjusted our analysis for the effects of socio-demographic variables such as gender, age, and years of education. To show that positive close and negative everyday contact with the majority (primary) group are both associated with attitudes towards the other immigrant (secondary) group over and above the effects of actual contact with this secondary outgroup, we also controlled for close positive and negative everyday contact with the other immigrant group. Due to some of the participants from the original sample not reporting having actual close positive or negative everyday contact with the outgroups, there was some missing data on various contact variables. As we were interested in the role of actual contact in the formation of outgroup attitudes, we decided not to impute missing data on the contact variables but handle the missing data with the use of listwise deletion. As a result, all participants who did not report having actual contact with members of the outgroups were removed from the analysis.

Due to a relatively small number of participants in each of the two samples, the testing of the moderation hypotheses (H3 and H4) was conducted in two parts. In the first part, multiple mediator model analysis was run separately for Russian and Estonian immigrants. Both sample sizes are sufficient only to detect small to medium effect mediation while using the bias-corrected bootstrapping method (Fritz & MacKinnon, 2007; see also Kenny, Kashy, & Bolger, 1998). Thus, testing H3 and H4 by applying a multiple mediator model for the two groups independently is a more suitable and accurate approach than applying moderated mediation analysis. However, this approach does not provide a direct test of the significance of difference between the indirect effects in the two groups and therefore it does not allow us to fully confirm and claim that group status moderates the obtained results. Thus, while considering the fact that the sample sufficient for moderated mediation analysis with group status as a moderator, accounting for both paths from the predictor to the mediator and the mediator to the outcome variable being moderated, would be a sample of 500 participants or larger (Preacher, Rucker, & Hayes, 2007, p. 209), in the second part, we have decided to subject our data to the moderated mediation analysis with group status as the moderator for exploratory purposes.

All hypotheses were tested with conditional process analysis (Hayes, 2013), using the PROCESS tool for SPSS. This ordinary least squares regression-based path analysis provides more accurate estimations of *p*-values for the regression coefficients than structural equation modelling with latent variables for smaller data sets with variables deviating from normal distribution.

The first part of hypotheses testing, that is the mediational analysis, included three regression analyses (for more details see Hayes, 2013). First, attitudes towards the majority group (Me1) and the ingroup's public collective self-esteem (Me2) were independently regressed on all control variables (gender, age, years of education and prior positive and

negative contact with the minority outgroup) and close positive (X1) and negative everyday contact (X2) with the majority group. Second, attitudes towards the other immigrant group (Y) were predicted by all control variables, close positive and everyday negative contact with the majority group, attitudes towards the majority group, and the ingroup's public collective self-esteem.

The second part of hypotheses testing, that is the exploratory moderated mediation analysis with group status as the moderator, was conducted on the total sample of the study. First, attitudes towards the majority group (Me1) and the ingroup's public collective self-esteem (Me2) were independently regressed on all control variables, close positive (X1) and negative everyday contact (X2) with the majority group, group status (Mo), and the interaction terms between close positive contact with the majority group and group status ($X1*Mo$) and negative everyday contact with the majority group and group status ($X2*Mo$). Second, attitudes towards the other immigrant group (Y) were predicted by all control variables, close positive and everyday negative contact with the majority group, attitudes towards the majority group, the ingroup's public collective self-esteem, group status, and the interaction terms between attitudes towards the majority group and group status ($Me1*Mo$) and the ingroup's public collective self-esteem and group status ($Me2*Mo$).

The strength and significance of the indirect effects representing the STEs were assessed with 95 % bias-corrected bootstrap confidence intervals based on 10 000 bootstrapped resamples (see Preacher et al., 2007; Hayes, 2013). All regression coefficients and indirect effects in the study are reported in an unstandardised form (*B*).

7 Results

Correlations among the variables, their means and standard deviations are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Means and Standard Deviations of the Variables Used in the Study and Correlations Between These Variables Among Estonian ($n = 171$) and Russian ($n = 180$) Immigrants in Finland.

[illegible]

Russians												
1. Gender	---	---	1	-.19*	.11	.08	.03	.07	.14	-.01	.11	.11
2. Age	43.76	11.94		1	-.05	.00	-.04	-.03	-.13	.04	-.04	-.06
3. Years of education	16.10	5.16			1	.13	-.10	.20**	-.12	.00	.15*	.27***
4. Contact: Estonians (close +)	3.21	0.92				1	.07	.30***	-.07	.18*	.14	.23**
5. Contact: Estonians (everyday -)	2.26	0.90					1	-.10	.26***	-.20**	-.10	-.30***
6. Contact Finns (close +)	4.05	0.66						1	-.15*	.28***	.34***	.17**
7. Contact Finns (everyday -)	2.34	0.79							1	-.26**	-.22**	-.05
8. Public collective self-esteem	3.35	0.68								1	.23**	.24**
9. Attitudes: Finns	5.71	0.74									1	.31***
10. Attitudes: Estonians	4.76	0.94										1

Note. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

The results of the first part of the analysis, in which the proposed model was tested among Estonian and Russian immigrants separately, are presented in Figure 2. The results show that among Estonian immigrants both positive and negative contact with Finns was significantly associated with more positive and more negative attitudes towards Finns, respectively. Only negative contact with the majority group was associated with lower public collective self-esteem of the ingroup, whereas no corresponding association occurred for positive contact. While attitudes towards Finns were positively associated with attitudes towards Russian immigrants, the association between public collective self-esteem and attitudes towards Russians was non-significant. Neither positive nor negative contact with Finns was directly associated with attitudes towards Russian immigrants.

Among Russian immigrants, both positive and negative contact with Finns was significantly associated with more positive and more negative attitudes towards Finns as well as with more positive and more negative public collective self-esteem, respectively. Both attitudes towards Finns and collective self-esteem were positively associated with attitudes towards Estonian immigrants, although this association was not of a great magnitude for public collective self-esteem ($B = 0.19, p = .050$). As in the Estonian sample, positive and negative contact with Finns was not directly associated with attitudes towards the minority outgroup.

 Figure 2 about here

$p^* \leq .05$. $p^{**} < .01$. $p^{***} < .001$.

Figure 2. The results of the OLS path analysis for the mediation model run separately among Estonian and Russian immigrants.

The obtained results indicate that both hypotheses about the STE resulting from the generalisation of attitudes towards the primary outgroup on the secondary outgroup were supported. In line with H1, positive close contact with members of the national majority group was associated with more positive attitudes towards the other immigrant group among both Estonians and Russians, and this effect occurred through more positive attitudes towards Finns. Specifically, the indirect positive effect equalled $B = 0.11$, 95% CI (0.030, 0.218) for Estonian and $B = 0.10$, 95% CI (0.024, 0.227) for Russian immigrants. Supporting H2, among members of both immigrant groups negative everyday contact with members of the national majority was associated with less positive attitudes towards the other immigrant group and this effect occurred through less positive attitudes toward Finns. This negative indirect effect equalled $B = -0.15$, 95% CI (-0.261, -0.071) among Estonian and $B = -0.05$, 95% CI (-0.128, -0.010) among Russian immigrants.

H3, stating that among Russian immigrants the effect of positive close contact with majority Finns on attitudes towards Estonian immigrants will be positive and indirect through

elevated public collective self-esteem, was supported. The indirect effect of positive close contact with Finns on attitudes towards Estonians via public collective self-esteem equalled $B = 0.04$, 95% CI (0.005, 0.114). As expected, the corresponding effect among Estonian immigrants was statistically non-significant with $B = 0.01$, 95% CI (-0.009, 0.059).

Also H4, stating that among Russian immigrants the effect of negative everyday contact with members of the majority group on attitudes towards Estonian immigrants will be negative and indirect through lowered public collective self-esteem, received support. The indirect effect of negative everyday contact with Finns on attitudes towards Estonians via public collective self-esteem just reached statistical significance with $B = -0.03$, 95% CI (-0.082, 0.000). In line with our predictions, the corresponding effect among Estonian immigrants did not reach statistical significance: $B = -0.01$, 95% CI (-0.057, 0.018). The model produced the same results among the two groups also without controlling for the effects of the socio-demographic variables and the effects of prior positive and negative contact with the minority outgroup.

In the second part, the exploratory moderated mediation analysis was run with the group status as the moderator. As expected due to the insufficient sample size, the interaction terms between contact variables and group status and public collective self-esteem and group status did not reach statistical significance (for all interaction terms $p > .10$). All the associations studied were, however, in the assumed directions.

8 Discussion

The present study contributes to the existing knowledge on the under-researched area of interminority relations in plural societies by examining the mediating mechanisms of the STE resulting from contact experiences with the national majority group. Specifically, we tested whether among minority group members positive close and negative everyday contact with members of the national majority are translated into attitudes towards other minority

groups. This has constituted the first two novelties of the present study. First, to date, only Bowman and Griffin (2012), Tausch et al. (2010) and recently Shook et al. (2015) and Mähönen and Jasinskaja-Lahti (2015) have examined the role of (positive) contact with the majority group in the formation of the STE towards other minority groups. Second, the role of negative contact in intergroup relations has in general been under-investigated and so far only once examined (Mähönen & Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2015) with reference to the STE. The obtained results have shown that in line with previous theorisations and empirical results (see Lolliot et al., 2013), the positive association between positive contact with the national majority group and attitudes towards the other immigrant group was mediated by more positive attitudes towards the national majority. The corresponding mediating effect of attitude generalisation, but of the opposite valence, was also found for negative contact with the national majority group.

Corroborating the important role of negative contact in the STE complements growing research on the role of negative contact in intergroup relations (e.g., Barlow et al., 2012; Graf et al., 2014). It also extends the existing theoretical framework of the STE by highlighting that negative majority-minority interactions can be as powerful in shaping attitudes of different minority groups towards one another as positive majority-minority contact is. This shows that not only positive but also negative contact with members of the national majority group has to be taken into account when the dynamics of interactions among different minority groups are of interest. In light of the obtained results, ignoring the role of negative contact in intergroup relations and focusing on only positive intergroup interactions would simplify the dynamics of majority-minority as well as interminority relations in diverse societies.

The third new contribution of the present research is the identification of a new mechanism mediating the STE among low-status minority groups. Thus far, the roles of the

ingroup's status and its public collective self-esteem has not been concurrently investigated in research on the STE. This study brings the first, preliminary evidence suggesting the importance of both group status and public collective self-esteem for the STE. As shown by the results, the association between both positive and negative contact with the majority group and attitudes towards another immigrant group among low-status Russian immigrants was mediated by public collective self-esteem. This finding highlights both the impact of majority-minority interactions on how minority groups perceive one another and the importance of the need to compensate the ingroup's esteem by derogating a secondary outgroup in the case of negative majority-minority interactions. It also extends previous studies in which negative contact was linked to lower *overall* collective self-esteem (Cassidy, O'Connor, Howe, & Warden 2004) and *private* collective self-esteem (Branscombe et al., 1999). Moreover, the obtained results are in line with previous studies in which public collective self-esteem was associated with more positive outgroup attitudes (Bikmen, 2011; Ruttenberg et al., 1996). Therefore, the results of this study contradict earlier theorisations linking high general collective self-esteem to more negative orientation towards outgroups (see Long & Spears, 1997; Rubin & Hewstone, 1998).

Importantly, our study highlights the need to better acknowledge the role of group status in research on the STE (see also Bikmen, 2011; Bowman & Griffin, 2012). Our results show that public collective self-esteem mediates STEs resulting from both positive and negative contact with the majority group, but only when predicting the attitudes of members of a lower-status minority towards higher-status minority group members. Thus, this pattern of results is more indicative of a diagonal than horizontal hostility. More specifically, the results suggest that diagonal hostility emerges when the low status minority group mobilises to restore the damage caused to the group's esteem by the negative treatment of the majority group. This is done at the expenses of another, a higher status minority group by increasing

hostile attitudes toward this group. In contrast, when interactions with the majority group are perceived as close and positive, this boosts public collective self-esteem of a low-status minority group and translates into more positive attitudes toward the higher status minority group. These results also indicate that for members of low-status minorities, the quality of contact with members of the national majority group seems to be more important for intergroup relations in diverse societies than for members of high-status minorities. Besides being in line with previous research of White and her colleagues (White & Langer, 1999; White et al., 2006), the findings of this study further clarify the psychological mechanisms involved in the formation of interminority relations: Interminority attitudes reflect the quality of interactions with the majority group followed by the gain or loss of public collective self-esteem. Thus, while research done so far focused on the status similarity of the primary and the secondary outgroup, this study points out at the particular importance of the minority ingroup's status, as determined by the group's position in the ethnic hierarchy in society.

As regards the practical implications of our findings, the results clearly show that the national majority group has the power to shape interminority relations. Moreover, they corroborate earlier results which point out that relative status not only to the majority group but to also other minority groups in society is an important factor in interminority relations (see Tawa et al., 2013; Tawa et al., 2015). Thus, both future research and practical interventions should better acknowledge the role of national majorities in supporting the formation of positive interminority relations. As the negative side of the coin, the present results can also be seen as evidence of the power that majority groups have to create and reproduce ethnic hierarchies. This happens not only through the explicit use of hierarchy-enhancing ideologies (see, e.g. Osajima, 2005) but also by interacting with different minority groups and thereby communicating about their status position in relation to the majority and other minorities. As shown in this study, the latter mechanism is especially salient for lower-

status, derogated minorities for which the STEs resulting from (positive and negative) contact were mediated by public collective self-esteem. If the majority group would not favour some minority groups over others, and if all minorities could enjoy a similar (high) status in society, interminority attitudes would not be based on ethnic hierarchies. This way, equal treatment received from the majority group would potentially contribute to more intergroup solidarity between different minority groups as well as more smooth interminority relations in general.

9 Limitations

As regards the limitations of the present study, first, positive and negative contact were not conceptualised equivalently. While positive contact was measured as both the quantity and the quality of close contact with majority Finns, negative contact was measured as the quality of casual everyday interactions with majority Finns in different social settings. We believe that such a conceptualisation and measurement of positive and negative contact suited well the hypotheses of the study and the current majority-minority situation in Finland. However, we encourage future studies to test the STEs resulting from majority-minority interactions with more equivalent measures of positive and negative contact.

Second, using the same scale to measure outgroup attitudes towards both primary and secondary outgroups could be criticised, as the results might be affected by shared method variance (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). However, previous research (e.g., Schmidt, Hewstone, Küpper, Zick, & Wagner, 2012) has shown that the STE is robust and does not depend on the use of similar or different measures of primary and secondary outgroup attitudes.

Third, the small sample sizes did not allow us to test the hypotheses of the present study with moderated mediation analysis as the primary analytical tool. Thus, the hypotheses H3 and H4 have been approved only when using a multiple mediator model in two immigrant groups separately, with the results of the moderated mediation analysis did not reaching

statistical significance. Therefore, although the results obtained in this study were in line with previous theorisations and strongly suggest that group status could be the important moderator of the STE among low-status minority groups, these findings should be corroborated by future research with the use of larger samples and preferably longitudinal design.

Fourth, as data used in this study were cross-sectional, it is not possible to fully assess the causal direction of the tested relationship between contact with the primary outgroup and attitudes towards the secondary outgroup. Our model, however, relied on previous theorisations (Pettigrew, 2009), as well as longitudinal (Tausch et al., 2010, Study 4) and experimental (Harwood, Paolini, Joyce, Rubin, & Arroyo, 2011) research on the STE showing that the causal path from contact with one outgroup to attitudes towards the other outgroup is more likely than the reversed causal association. Nevertheless, we invite future research which would examine the proposed causal relations by using an experimental or longitudinal research design.

Last but not least, although the findings shed new light on interminority relations, we would like to emphasise that they may not be fully generalisable to other social or national contexts. As immigration to Finland is a relatively new phenomenon (see Minority Groups in Finland) and the two minorities studied are White European immigrant groups, the results may not reflect the social reality of countries in which the history of oppression of some minority groups is much longer and has continued for generations (e.g., the US). Nevertheless, the pattern of results of this study resembles that obtained by Tawa and his colleagues (Tawa et al., 2013; Tawa et al., 2015) on the competition over relative power which is a part of interminority relations. In addition, we believe that our results could be even more applicable to the contemporary European immigration context, namely when considering internal EU migration and its increase after the EU eastwards enlargements of 2004, 2007 and 2013. This is because current internal EU (im)migration involves different

national groups of White Europeans which still differ in status (e.g., ‘older’ West vs. ‘newer’ East EU member states) but all compete over scarce resources.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by the Academy of Finland [Grant No 267981; SINI project of Prof. Jasinskaja-Lahti and Grant No 257079; LADA project of Dr. Mähönen].

We would like to thank Viivi Mäkinen (Department of Social Research, University of Helsinki, Finland) for her help in data collection and coding and Katrina Jurva (Department of Social Research, University of Helsinki, Finland) for the language revision.

References

- Aberson, C. L. (2015). Positive intergroup contact, negative intergroup contact, and threat as predictors of cognitive and affective dimensions of prejudice. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*. Advance online publication.
- Allport G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, United Kingdom: Addison-Wesley.
- Barlow, F. K., Louis, W. R., & Terry, D. J. (2010). Minority report: Social identity, cognitions of rejection and intergroup anxiety predicting prejudice from one racially marginalized group towards another. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 40, 805–818.
- Barlow, F. K., Paolini, S., Pedersen, A., Hornsey, M. J., Radke, H. R. M., Harwood, J.,... Sibley, C. G. (2012). The contact caveat: Negative contact predicts increased prejudice more than positive contact predicts reduced prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38, 1629–1643.

- Barry, D. T., & Grilo, C. M. (2003). Cultural, self-esteem, and demographic correlates of perception of personal and group discrimination among East Asian immigrants. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 73, 223–229.
- Bikmen, N. (2011). Asymmetrical effects of contact between minority groups: Asian and Black students in a small college. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 17, 186–194.
- Bowman, N. A., & Griffin, T. M. (2012). Secondary transfer effects of interracial contact: The moderating role of social status. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 18, 35–44.
- Branscombe, N. R., Schmitt, M. T., & Harvey, R. D. (1999). Perceiving pervasive discrimination among African Americans: Implications for group identification and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 135–149.
- Cassidy, C., O'Connor, R. C., Howe, C., & Warden, D. (2004). Perceived discrimination and psychological distress: The role of personal and ethnic self-esteem. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 51, 329–339.
- Craig, M. A., & Richeson, J. A. (2012). Coalition or derogation? How perceived discrimination influences intraminority intergroup relations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102, 759–777.
- Crocker, J., Luhtanen, R., Blaine, B., & Broadnax, S. (1994). Collective self-esteem and psychological well-being among White, Black, and Asian college students. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 503–513.
- Fazio, R. H., Eiser, J. R., & Shook, N. J. (2004). Attitude formation through exploration: Valence asymmetries. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*, 87, 293–311.
- Fritz, M. S., & MacKinnon (2007). Required sample size to detect the mediated effect. *Psychological Science*, 18, 233–239.

- Graf, S., Paolini, S., & Rubin, M. (2014). Negative intergroup contact is more influential, but positive intergroup contact is more common: Assessing contact prominence and contact prevalence in five Central European countries. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 44, 536–547.
- Hagendoorn, L. (1993). Ethnic categorization and outgroup exclusion: Cultural values and social stereotypes in the construction of ethnic hierarchies. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 16, 26–51.
- Hagendoorn, L. (1995). Intergroup biases in multiple group systems: The perception of ethnic hierarchies. In W. Stroebe and M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European Review of Social Psychology* (pp. 199–228). Chichester, United Kingdom: John Wiley.
- Harwood, J., Paolini, S., Joyce, N., Rubin, M., & Arroyo, A. (2011). Secondary transfer effects from imagined contact: Group similarity affects the generalization gradient. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 50, 180–189.
- Hewstone, M., Cairns, E., Voci, A., Hamberger, J., & Niens, U. (2006). Intergroup contact, forgiveness, and experience of “the troubles” in Northern Ireland. *Journal of Social Issues*, 62, 99–120.
- Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Hindriks, P., Verkuyten, M., & Coenders, M. (2014). Interminority attitudes: The roles of ethnic and national identifications, contact, and multiculturalism. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 77, 54–74.
- Jaakkola, M. (2005). *Suomalaisten suhtautuminen maahanmuuttajiin vuosina 1987–2003 [Attitudes of Finns towards immigrants in years 1987–2007]*. Työpoliittinen tutkimus. Helsinki, Finland: Ministry of Labour.

- Jaakkola, M. (2009). *Maahanmuuttajat suomalaisten näkökulmasta. Asennemuutokset 1987–2007 [Immigrants from the perspective of Finns. Change in attitudes in years 1987–2007]*. Helsinki, Finland: City of Helsinki Information Centre.
- Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., Liebkind, K., & Perhoniemi, R. (2006). Perceived discrimination and well-being: A victim study of different immigrant groups. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 16, 267–284.
- Kenny, D. A., Kashy, D. A., & Bolger, N. (1998). Data analysis in social psychology. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 233–265). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Lolliot, S., Schmid, K., Hewstone, M., Al Ramiah, A., Tausch, N., & Swart, H. (2013). Generalized effects of intergroup contact: The secondary transfer effect. In G. Hodson & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *Advances in intergroup relations* (pp. 81–112). London, United Kingdom: Psychology Press.
- Lolliot, S., Fell, B., Schmid, K., Wölfer, R., Swart, H., Voci, A.,... Hewstone, M. (2015). Measures of intergroup contact. In G. J. Boyle, D. H. Saklofske & G. Matthews (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological constructs* (pp. 652–683). London, United Kingdom: Academic Press.
- Long, K., & Spears, R. (1997). The self-esteem hypothesis revisited: Differentiation and the disaffected. In R. Spears, P. J. Oakes, N. Ellemers, & S. A. Haslam (Eds.), *The social psychology of stereotyping and group life* (pp. 296–317). Oxford, United Kingdom: Blackwell.
- Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1992). A collective self-esteem scale: Self-evaluation of one's social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18, 302–318.

- Martinovic, B., Verkuyten, M., & Weesie, J. (2011). Group identity, ethnic separatism and multiple out-groups: The Basque case. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 21*, 28–40.
- Mähönen, T. A., & Jasinskaja-Lahti, I. (2015). Ramifications of positive and negative contact experiences among remigrants from Russia to Finland. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*. Advance online publication.
- Osajima, K. (2005). Asian Americans as the model minority: An analysis of the popular press image in the 1960s and 1980s. In K. A. Ono (Ed.), *A companion to Asian American studies* (pp. 215–225). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Paolini, S., Harwood, J., & Rubin, M. (2010). Negative intergroup contact makes group memberships salient: Explaining why intergroup conflict endures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 36*, 1723–1738.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49*, 65–85.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (2009). Secondary transfer effect of contact: Do intergroup contact effects spread to noncontacted outgroups? *Social Psychology, 40*, 55–65.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 751–783.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2008). How does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Meta-analytic tests of three mediators. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 38*, 922–934.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*, 879–903.

- Preacher, K. J., Rucker, D. D., & Hayes, A. F. (2007). Addressing moderated mediation hypotheses: Theory, methods, and prescriptions. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 42, 185–227.
- Pyszczynski, T., Greenberg, J., Solomon, S., Arndt, J., & Schimel, J. (2004). Why do people need self-esteem? A theoretical and empirical review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130, 435–468.
- Rosenberg, M. (1979). *Conceiving the self*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Rubin, M., & Hewstone, M. (1998). Social identity theory's self-esteem hypothesis: A review and some suggestions for clarification. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2, 40–62.
- Ruttenberg, J., Zea, M. C., & Sigelman, C. K. (1996). Collective identity and intergroup prejudice among Jewish and Arab students in the United States. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 136, 209–220.
- Schalk-Soekar, S. R., van de Vijver, F. J., & Hoogsteder, M. (2004). Attitudes toward multiculturalism of immigrants and majority members in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 28, 533–550.
- Schmid, K., Hewstone, M., Küpper, B., Zick, A., & Wagner, U. (2012). Secondary transfer effects of intergroup contact: A cross-national comparison in Europe. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 75, 28–51.
- Schmid, K., Hewstone, M., & Tausch, N. (2014). Secondary transfer effects of intergroup contact via social identity complexity. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 53, 443–462.
- Schmitt, M. T., Branscombe, N. R., Postmes, T., & Garcia, A. (2014). The consequences of perceived discrimination for psychological well-being: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 140, 921–948.

- Shook, N. J., Fazio, R. H., & Eiser, J. R. (2007). Attitude generalization: Similarity, valence, and extremity. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 43, 641–647.
- Shook, N. J., Hopkins, P. D., Koech, J. M. (2015). The effect of intergroup contact on secondary group attitudes and social dominance orientation. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*. Advance online publication.
- Snellman, A., & Ekehammar, B. (2005). Ethnic hierarchies, ethnic prejudice, and social dominance orientation. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 15, 83–94.
- Statistic Finland (2012). *Nationality according to age and sex by region 1990–2012 (table)*. Retrieved from http://193.166.171.75/Dialog/varval.asp?ma=020_vaerak_tau_101_en&ti=Nationality+according+to+age+and+sex+by+region+1990+%2D+2012&path=../Database/StatFin/vrm/vaerak/&lang=1&multilang=en
- Statistics Finland (2014a). *Foreign-language speakers account for 90 per cent of the population growth in 2013*. Retrieved from http://tilastokeskus.fi/til/vaerak/2013/vaerak_2013_2014-03-21_tie_001_en.html
- Statistics Finland (2014b). *Population with foreign background 2013*. Retrieved from http://www.stat.fi/tup/julkaisut/tiedostot/julkaisuluettelo/yvrm_uls_201300_2014_1_2286_net.pdf
- Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In M. A. Hogg & D. Abrams (Eds.), *Intergroup relations* (pp. 94–109). Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
- Tausch, N., Hewstone, M., Kenworthy, J. B., Psaltis, C., Schmid, K., Popan, J. P.,... Hughes, J. (2010). Secondary transfer effects of intergroup contact: Alternative accounts and underlying processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98, 282–302.

- Tawa, J., Negrón, R., Suyemoto, K. L., & Carter, A. S. (2015). The effect of resource competition on Blacks' and Asians' social distance using a virtual world methodology. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*. Advance online publication.
- Tawa, J., Suyemoto, K. L., & Tauriac, J. J. (2013). Triangulated threat: A model of Black and Asian race-relations in a context of White dominance. In S. Pinder (Ed.), *American multicultural studies* (pp. 229–247). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Techakesari, P., Barlow, F. K., Hornsey, M. J., Sung, B., Thai, M., & Chak, J. L. Y. (2015). An investigation of positive and negative contact as predictors of intergroup attitudes in the United States, Hong Kong, and Thailand. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 46, 454–468.
- Tropp, L. R., & Pettigrew, T. (2006). Relationships between intergroup contact and prejudice among minority and majority status groups. *Psychological Science*, 16, 951–957.
- Voci & Hewstone (2003). Intergroup contact and prejudice toward immigrants in Italy: The mediational role of anxiety and the moderational role of group salience. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 6, 37–54.
- White, J. B., & Langer, E. J. (1999). Horizontal hostility: Relations between similar minority groups. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55, 537–559.
- White, J. B., Schmitt, M. T., & Langer, E. J. (2006). Horizontal hostility: Multiple minority groups and differentiation from the mainstream. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 9, 339–358.
- YLE (7.02.2015). *Professori: Venäläisten maanosto-oikeus ja kaksoiskansalaisuus vastoin tervettä järkeä [Professor: The right to purchase land by Russians and their double citizenship is against common sense]*. Retrieved on 23, March, 2015 from

http://yle.fi/uutiset/professori_venalaisten_maanosto-oikeus_ja_kaksoiskansalaisuus_vastoin_tervetta_jarkea/7789264